



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

grove that was certainly considerably more than a kilometre distant could not be spoken of as *ad portam Capenam*. Therefore the rhetor Felix would not have spoken of himself as working *ad portam Capenam* if he had been working in the *lucus Martis*. Furthermore, while Jahn's explanation that Felix had his lecture room in this part of the city is perfectly possible, its reference may just as probably be applied to his house. The Caelian was a favorite residential quarter during the empire. The passage from Symmachus need mean nothing more than that the proximity of the shrine of the *Camenae*—always regarded as a source of poetic inspiration—to the temple of *Honos* and *Virtus* emphasized the real connection between literary success and official position (*honos*) through *virtus*, a connection just illustrated so effectively in the case of Ausonius. Any further implication seems to me improbable because wholly unnecessary. I think, therefore, there is no real support for the first explanation of the scholiast in either of these supposed parallels.

In the second place the correspondence between *antrum Vulcani* and *antrum Cyclopiis* might be suggestive, were it not for the additional modifiers *Aeoliis vicinum rupibus*. This is so obvious that one would regard any mention of it as a waste of time, had it not been apparently overlooked. It is the *Aeoliis vicinum rupibus antrum Vulcani* that is in the mind of the poet, and this is closely united with *lucus Martis*. The two belong together, and it is manifestly impossible to explain *lucus Martis* as referring to an assembling-place of poets in Rome, and *antrum Vulcani* as referring to the Lipari islands. If the first refers to the temple of Mars in Rome, the second must also refer to some monument or locality in the same neighborhood, and to identify *Aeoliis rupibus* with any part of the Caelian hill would tax the ingenuity of the most imaginative of topographers.

The impossibility of admitting his first explanation of Juvenal's reference does not of course impugn the veracity of the scholiast's statement that poets had been wont to read in the grove of Mars.

S. B. P.

--- OVID *FASTI* IV. 209

Ardua iam dudum resonat tinnitibus Ide,
tutus ut infanti vagiat ore puer.

- 209 Pars clipeos *manibus*, galeas pars tundit inanes:
hoc Curetes habent, hoc Corybantes opus.
res latuit, priscique manent imitamina facti:
aera deae comites raucaeque terga movent.

- 213 cymbala pro galeis, pro scutis tympana pulsant,
tibia dat Phrygios, ut dedit ante, modos.

In verse 209, twenty-eight MSS read *manibus*, two MSS give *rudibus*, Lactantius has *sudibus*, while editors in general read *rudibus*.

The change rests, I believe, on a mistaken basis. Tradition gave the Curetes sword and shield as it is evident from Dionysius Hal. ii. 60: *χορείαν δὲ καὶ κίνησιν ἐνόπλιον, καὶ τὸν ἐν ταῖς ἀσπίσιν ἀποτελούμενον ὑπὸ τῶν ἐγχειριδίων ψόφον, εἴ τι δὲ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις τεκμηροῦσθαι λόγοις, Κοῦρητες ἦσαν οἱ πρῶτοι καταστησάμενοι*. It is probably to this tradition that we owe the change of *manibus* to *rudibus*.

But in descriptions of the Curetes tradition was not always blindly followed; Apollodorus, for instance (i. 1. 7) gave spears to the Curetes, and a terra-cotta relief reproduced in Roscher shows Curetes striking shields together. The pyrrhic was a development of the Curete dance, but the pyrrhic relief in the Acropolis Museum shows the right hand empty, as does the similar relief found at Praeneste.

Ovid, then, was not without a precedent in not following tradition, and that he did not follow it is evident from the position of the helmets, which are not worn on the head, but carried in the hand. Even the editors of *rudibus* could not follow tradition exactly, for some of the participants must bear sword and shield, others sword and helmet. Now as Ovid evidently did not follow the accepted tradition, there is a possible, perhaps probable, view of his words which will allow us to accept *manibus* as the right reading, in accordance with the great majority of MSS.

The key to the matter lies, I think, in v. 213: *cymbala pro galeis, pro scutis tympana pulsant*. We should bear in mind that Ovid is describing the ministers of Cybele, the Corybantes, and that the emphasis lies on them, not on Curetes. But the Corybantes carried tympana and cymbala only, and if we are to have an exact parallel with the Curetes, then the latter, from whom, as Ovid says, the Corybantes are derived, must bear only such weapons as can be replaced by tympana and cymbala. This exact correspondence can be found by reading *manibus* in vs. 209, for then we shall have the shields struck with the hand for the tympana (*pro scutis tympana*), and the helmets for the cymbala (*cymbala pro galeis*), but the helmets must be struck together. The parallel is then perfect, swords being omitted as having no counterpart among the instruments of the Corybantes.

W. E. D. DOWNES

FARMINGTON, MAINE

NOTE ON PLATO *PHILEBUS* 11 B, C.

Φίληθος μὲν τοίνυν ἀγαθὸν εἶναι φησι τὸ χαίρειν πᾶσι ζώοις . . . τὸ δὲ παρ' ἡμῶν ἀμφισβήτημά ἐστι, μὴ ταῦτα, ἀλλὰ τὸ φρονεῖν καὶ τὸ νοεῖν . . . ἀμείνω καὶ λῶφ γίγνεσθαι ξύμπασιν, ὅσαπερ αὐτῶν δυνατὰ μεταλαβεῖν· δυνατοῖς δὲ μετασχεῖν ὠφελιμώτατον ἀπάντων εἶναι πᾶσι τοῖς οὐσί τε καὶ ἐσομένοις.

There are two problems here: (1) The use of *ἀγαθόν* without the article; (2) The construction of *δυνατοῖς δὲ μετασχεῖν*, etc.